

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 12-20, 22-27, 29-31, 39-41, and 43 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 11, 21, 28, 32-38, 42, and 44 were previously canceled.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Notice of Noncompliance Amendment

The amendment document filed January 20, 2009 was considered noncompliant for failing to include proper status identifiers before each claim. Specifically, the amendment of claim 39 to remove a single instance of the letter “e” was unclear because of the use of strike through. The current amendment of claim 39 uses double brackets to indicate the removal of the letter “e.” The remainder of the remarks and amendments in this document correspond to those filed on January 20, 2009.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejections over Allen in view of Ogino

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 12-14, 16-19, 22-26, and 29-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,892,535 to Allen *et al.* (“Allen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,454 to Ogino *et al.* (“Ogino”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Allen does not teach or suggest “a delay module coupled to the video input to delay a line of the uncompressed video signal,” and “a subtraction module coupled to the delay module, wherein the subtraction module subtracts a subsequent line of the video signal from the delayed line of the video signal,” as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Allen does not teach or suggest “wherein the predictive coding comprises: delaying a first line of the composite video signal, and subtracting a second line of the composite video signal from the first line of the composite video signal to create the video predictive coded video signal,” as newly recited in claim 1. Rather, Allen teaches video predictive coding using the MPEG-2 standard algorithm. (Allen, 5:15-30.) The MPEG-2 standard algorithm does not

teach or suggest predictive coding comprising delaying a first line of a composite video signal, and subtracting a second line of the composite video signal from the first line to create the video predictive coded signal. (*International Standard ISO/IEC 13818*; *see also*, Pelayo *et al.*, “Analysis of the MPEG-2 Encoding Algorithm with ROSA1,” available at http://wotan.liu.edu/docis/dbl/enitcs/2003_80__AOTMEA.html (last visited 1/19/2009).)

Ogino does not cure these deficiencies. Ogino teaches and suggests superimposing an anti-duplication signal onto a video signal. Ogino does not teach or suggest “wherein the predictive coding comprises delaying a first line of the composite video signal, and subtracting a second line of the composite video signal from the first line of the composite video signal to create the video predictive coded video signal,” as newly recited in claim 1. Rather, Ogino teaches using a delay module and a subtraction module to supply a spectrally spread anti-duplication control signal component every second chip to the SS anti-duplication control signal detection section. (Ogino, 18:29-40.) Ogino contains no teachings or suggestion concerning encoding.

Moreover, the combination of Allen with Ogino would not result in the subject matter of claim 1. Allen's teachings are limited to a distribution network using MPEG-2 encoding, while Ogino teaches and suggests superimposing a anti-duplication control signal over a video signal. Accordingly, the combination of Allen with Ogino would result in a distribution network using MPEG-2 encoding with an anti-duplication control signal superimposed on the video signal. This combination would fail to teach each and every limitation recited in amended claim 1.

Independent claims 9, 18, and 25 also recite similarly distinguishing features as distinguished above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 9, 18, and 25 are also patentable over Allen and Ogino, considered alone or in combination. Claims 2, 4-5, 7-10, 12-14, 16-19, 20, 22-24, 26, and 29-31 depend from one of independent claims 1, 9, 18, and 25. They are thus patentable over Allen and Ramaswamy, considered alone or in combination, for at least the reasons provided above and in further view of their own distinguishing features. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Rejections over Allen in view of Ogino and Smith

Claims 6, 15, 20, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Allen in view of Ogino and U.S. Patent No. 6,088,732 to Smith *et al.* (“Smith”). Claims 6, 15, 20, and 27 are distinguished from Allen in view of Ogino by virtue of their dependence on claims 1, 9, 18, and 25, as discussed above. Smith fails to cure the deficiencies of Allen and Ogino. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Rejections over Allen in view of Ogino and Zhang

Claims 39-41 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Allen in view of Ogino and U.S. Patent No. 6,121,711 to Zhang *et al.* (“Zhang”). Independent claim 39, from which claims 40, 41, and 43 depend, recites similarly distinguishing features as distinguished above with respect to claim 1. Zhang fails to cure the deficiencies of Allen and Ogino with respect to these features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully withdrawal of the rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 50-4562 referencing Docket No. 16LN-133588. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: March 5, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Michael A. Febbo

Registration No.: 59,205

SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER &
HAMPTON LLP
333 South Hope Street, 48th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1448
Telephone: (858) 720-8900
Facsimile: (858) 509-3691